



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

# The Jewish Quarterly Review.

---

JULY, 1891.

---

## CRITICAL PROBLEMS OF THE SECOND PART OF ISAIAH.<sup>1</sup>

### I.

THERE is, perhaps, no better way of illustrating the progress of Old Testament criticism than to compare the forms assumed by the great critical problems in the past and in the present, not, of course, in the spirit of self-exaltation, but simply to clear up our own position, and to show ourselves not unworthy of those eminent predecessors to whom we owe so much. It may be that the critical problems of the Hexateuch call much more loudly for the application of this method than those of Isaiah. But if I may be permitted a brief reference to personal circumstances, I believe that the reader will justify me for selecting the second part of Isaiah as the subject of this survey. It so happens that at the close of each previous decade of my student-life my attention has been irresistibly drawn to the greatest of the prophetic books. In 1870 I put together such critical and exegetical results as I had been able to reach in a volume called *The Book of Isaiah Chronologically Arranged*. At that time the book stood alone; it is now, naturally enough, superseded by Professor Driver's scholarly handbook, which in its main features corresponds very nearly to my own work, and has the advantage of being written eighteen years

---

<sup>1</sup> This article originally formed two public lectures, delivered by the author in the university of Oxford, May, 1891.

later. One of these features is the adoption of the view that Isaiah xl.-lxvi. forms a single prophetic work, with a unity of its own.

It was about ten years later, in 1880 and 1881, that the present writer brought out two fresh works on Isaiah, one in two large volumes, the other in but fourteen columns of an encyclopædia. In the former (experience having proved the unpreparedness of the public), scrupulous regard was paid to the delicate susceptibilities of the orthodox, and though the data of criticism were presented to view, and the then state of the controversy was objectively sketched, the reader was left to form his own critical theories for himself. To save his conscience, however, and to help more advanced students, the writer set forth his own matured results in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. And now the year 1891 has come, which means the end of another ten years of study. Is it not natural for me to ask myself whether I was nearer the truth, as regards the second part of Isaiah, in 1880 or in 1870, and if in 1880, whether I have improved at all upon the imperfect results then attained? Let me try to answer these questions.—In my first attempt in the criticism of Isaiah, by the side of some critical discrepancies from Ewald, which are not strikingly either progressive or retrogressive, there is this one retrograde step to be noticed, that I treat Isaiah xl.-lxvi. as forming an artistic whole, divided by the two-fold occurrence of a refrain (Isaiah xlix. 22, lvii. 21) into three books of equal length. In the Encyclopædia article, on the other hand, I maintain that the appearance of unity is as fallacious as in the case of some other books, and that the last twenty-seven chapters of Isaiah contain no less than nine inserted or appended passages belonging to different periods. The main position of my article (*i.e.*, the denial of the unity of II. Isaiah) has since 1881 been taken up independently by several other writers, to whom in due time I shall refer, but it has yet to fight its way to general acceptance. I feel it my duty, in the altered circumstances

of Bible study, to give greater publicity than heretofore to views which are of considerable importance, if correct, for the study of Isaiah.

But before proceeding further, I should like to justify the statement that these views, if correct, are of considerable importance. I will not now urge purely critical considerations, but will simply point out that one reason why the theory of the non-Isaianic origin of Is. xl.-lxvi. has made its way so slowly among English students is the fact that this theory, in the form in which it has been usually presented, does not fully satisfy the conditions of the problem. Nor is it only intelligent orthodox laymen (laymen, I mean, from a scholar's point of view) who find a difficulty in the new theory as commonly set forth. Klostermann and Bredenkamp are not merely orthodox theologians, but able scholars, and both of them repudiate the delightfully simple theory that Is. xl.-lxvi. was written at the close of the Exile by a Jew in Babylon. Their own theory, anticipated in a vague sort of way in 1853 by Sir Edward Strachey, is that fragments of Isaiah's writings were worked up and completed by a much later hand. Nägelsbach, too, is not merely an orthodox, but a sound, though somewhat narrow, scholar; and he, though he speaks, like Delitzsch, of the three Enneads of Is. xl.-lxvi., admits that the third Ennead does not deserve the name, as it contains only five discourses. Isaiah, he thinks, may have been overtaken by death before he could properly arrange and develop his materials, and the consequence was that this part of the book fell into the hands of an interpolator during the Exile. This theory is even more crude, arbitrary, and unsatisfactory than that of Klostermann and Bredenkamp; but one or another of their theories may still, perhaps, be a convenient resting-place for some slowly-moving minds.

Let me add that in conducting my argument I wish to preserve the most friendly courtesy towards those who may at present differ from me. I make but one easy and

perhaps unnecessary stipulation, viz., that they would from time to time re-peruse the second part of Isaiah, putting preconceived theories aside, and seek at each fresh perusal for a clearer view of the facts of exegesis. These facts are very delicate, and without constant practice it is only too easy even for good Hebrew scholars to overlook them. It is not well to be too hasty in deciding, nor to rely too exclusively on one's own vision. If, however, a number of trained students agree in constantly recognising certain exegetical phenomena which conflict with what has become the tradition of modern criticism, it is very improbable that they are altogether wrong. It is not their interest to subvert the decisions of the past, nor can it be in itself pleasant to any lover of the Bible (and who should love the Bible more than the critic ?) to disintegrate a fine Hebrew work with a superficial appearance of unity. It may, indeed, be a fact of experience that a thoroughly justified and careful disintegration is rewarded by deepened insight into Israelitish history; but, though well assured of this, few critics enter on the work of analysis without some reluctance. If, therefore, for more than a hundred years past, voices have been raised at intervals in favour of the disintegration of II. Isaiah, and if to-day the old theory is being revived in more elaborate and defensible forms, it becomes honest students of Isaiah not to shut themselves up in the comfortable house of tradition, but to open their eyes to facts, and reconstruct some part of their old habitation. I ask, then, for a careful consideration of the exegetical facts which are adduced by the new school. My own explanation of the facts, published in 1881, was, of course, an imperfect one. Further study has, I trust, enabled me to improve it. But I will most gladly exchange it, either in part or altogether, for any theory which corresponds better to the facts, and fits better into an intelligible historical sketch of Hebrew literature.

But perhaps some one may say, Why put forward a fresh theory at all? Why not rest content with one which

satisfied two such scholars as Gesenius and Hitzig? I might say, in reply, that though Gesenius was admirably equipped on the linguistic side, he had not that power of putting himself into close relation with his author which any truly great exegete possesses, and that Hitzig was obstinate and paradoxical to a degree, which greatly impaired his influence as an Old Testament scholar. But the real answer is that criticism cannot stand still. As long as even probable solutions of complicated problems can be obtained, we are bound to seek them, and more especially when the problems are connected with a book the most interesting and fascinating in the world—I mean the “Divine Library,” the Bible. And if you want a proof that disintegration can be combined with an ardent love of the Scriptures, take the case of the first disintegrator of the Second Isaiah, Don Isaac Abarbanel, who proved both by word and by deed, his enthusiasm for the treasure of the Torah. Long before Koppe and Eichhorn, he wrote down this observation, in his commentary on Isaiah (finished A.D. 1498), *à propos* of Isaiah liii.: “Nor is there anything remarkable in this prophecy coming in the midst of a series of promises of the future redemption; for the prophecies in this book are not all of them connected or related to one another, but each separate prophecy and each separate promise uttered by the prophet stands by itself, as may be seen by the contents.”<sup>1</sup>

Let us pass on now to the history of the analysis of II. Isaiah. The hint thrown out by Abarbanel had no critical consequences. The modern school of fragmentists dates back to Koppe, the author of the notes to the German edition of Bishop Lowth’s *Isaiah* (1779-1781). This was followed by Augusti, Bertholdt, and Eichhorn, the last of whom, led astray by Koppe, too boldly separated the text of Isaiah into eighty-five pieces. Gesenius and Hitzig, however, stood firm on the side of unity, and the words in

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Fifty-third Chapter of Isaiah, according to the Jewish Interpreters.* II. Translations, by S. R. Driver and Ad. Neubauer (1877), p. 188.

which the former, whose name is still so justly honoured among us, expressed himself, deserve quotation: "The only concession," he says, "which can be made is that the prophet did not write the whole book straight on, but composed the different sections at different times, after which they were united, or rather worked up together. Thus, at any rate, lvi. 9—lviii. 14; lxiii. 1—6; and lxiii. 7—lxv. 25, can be thought of as having had a separate existence, though they were afterwards, no doubt, worked up together, on which account, too, there is often a transition between them, and a seam can seldom be discovered."<sup>1</sup> Precisely the same view is expressed by Hitzig, who fully admits the fragmentary origin of the book, but insists on the unity ultimately produced when the author brought the separate fragments together, and seeks to strengthen his argument for unity by adopting a bright idea of Friedrich Rückert. This idea was that the prophet's work, which we call the Second Isaiah, was divided by the author himself into three books of nine sections or chapters each, and that the two former books were marked off by the closing refrain: "No peace, saith Yahveh (or saith my God), to the wicked" (xlviii. 22; lvii. 21). There was much wise moderation in the attitude of these great scholars, the old and the young. They candidly admitted an element of truth in the theory of the fragmentists, but could not tolerate the denial of the unity of the book, and the ascription of the sections which composed it to different authors. Their position is, I think, untenable, and yet I am sure that by their policy of moderate conservatism they did good service in their day to criticism. For the analysis of ancient writings requires to be practised with circumspection, and this was a quality in which the early critics were deficient. There were two ways in which the school of Koppe might have sought to justify its procedure. It might have produced either a

---

<sup>1</sup> Gesenius, *Der Prophet Jesaju*, III. (1821), p. 15.

thorough commentary on Isaiah, or a sketch of Jewish literature in the framework of contemporary history, showing, if possible, that such extreme disintegration was not uncalled for on exegetical and historical grounds. Now, it is true that Eichhorn did translate and comment on the Hebrew prophets, but he aimed more than was right at popularity. He had his reward, for he won the ear of Goethe, but he did not win that of Hebrew scholars like Gesenius. The other work which might have been asked for—a history of Hebrew literature—Eichhorn wisely left unwritten. That was reserved for a younger Göttingen scholar, not a member of any of the existing schools, Heinrich Ewald.

This great critic, whose life I have sketched at considerable length elsewhere,<sup>1</sup> began his critical career as an independent conservative. At the age of twenty he published a work against the literary analysis of Genesis, whether into documents or into fragments. Eight years later, he set an example of honesty by retracting it; not, however because he had gone over to any one of the existing parties, but because he had learned to estimate better the complexity of the problems of the Old Testament literature. And note the caution of the man. Not till 1835 (he was then thirty-two years of age) did he bring out a second work implying a definite judgment for or against the critical analysis of Hebrew writings. This was his work on the Psalms, which, I confess, however stimulating, is by no means equal to his great work on the Prophets. The first edition of *Die Propheten* appeared in 1840 and 1841; and here, in spite of his weakness as a dialectician, Ewald has, if you will only study him well, carried the criticism of the second Isaiah to the furthest point which had as yet been reached. I will not take up my reader's time by describing his results, as he embodied them in the second

---

<sup>1</sup> "The Life and Works of Heinrich Ewald," *The Expositor*, 1886 (2), pp. 241, etc., 361, etc.

edition, published in 1867.<sup>1</sup> The prophecies of the Second Isaiah originated, according to him, at the close of the Exile, in "fly-sheets, which the surging stream of the time drew forth, one after another, from the prophet."<sup>2</sup> Hence the changes in the prophet's mood, and the references which he makes to the varying effects of his prophecies on the people. These "pamphlets or fly-leaves," however, were collected by the prophet in two books, one comprising chapters xl.-xlviii., and the other, chapters xlix.-lx., to which, as Ewald thinks, the prophet added lxi. 1—lxiii. 6, as an epilogue, and afterwards lxiii. 7—lxvi. 24, as an appendix. It should be added that Ewald peremptorily rejects the plausible threefold division suggested by Rückert, and adopted by Hitzig and Ruetschi, and afterwards by Delitzsch and myself.

This, however, is not the whole of Ewald's critical theory. He also felt compelled by exegetical phenomena to recognise in the Second Isaiah a considerable element derived from earlier books. He had already pointed out, in the masterly introduction to his book, that words and thoughts of earlier prophets were continually revived by more recent prophetic writers, including the Second Isaiah.<sup>3</sup> In the section on Isaiah xl.-lxvi., he showed how this theory worked. Creative as the prophetic writer is, he often does not disdain to imitate models; nor, says Ewald, "on closer consideration is it possible not to see that he also inserts whole passages of some length from older prophets with little or no alteration, which can be plainly distinguished as regards their primary meaning and the time of their origin." These passages are xl. 1, 2, lii. 13—liii. 12, lvi. 9—lvii. 11, in which Ewald finds a great similarity to Mic. vi., vii., and which, like that prophecy, or those prophecies, he ascribes to a prophet of the reign of Manasseh; and further, chapters lviii. and lix. and some

<sup>1</sup> Translated by Mr. J. F. Smith, in five volumes, 1875—1881. (Williams and Norgate.)

<sup>2</sup> *The Prophets*, E.T., iv. 254; cf. i. 90.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, i. 82-83.

smaller passages, which are, he thinks, introduced from a writer closely allied to Ezekiel, and probably contemporary with that prophet.<sup>1</sup>

It will at once be noticed by the student that in this complicated theory, Ewald makes more concessions to the fragmentists than either Gesenius or Hitzig. He will only admit an imperfect unity in the book ; for lxi. 1—lxiii. 6, and lxiii. 7—lxvi. 24, he views as additions representing after-thoughts of the writer, and several passages in the body of the work he regards as extracts from older prophetic writings. In this increased complication we must, I think, acknowledge a sign of progress. As I ventured to remark, ten years ago, "Complication, and not simplicity, is the note of the questions and of the answers which constitute Old Testament criticism."<sup>2</sup> Gesenius and Hitzig went too far in their natural rebound from the pernicious extreme of the fragmentists ; the right mean was seen at a glance by Ewald. No unprejudiced reader of the Second Isaiah, if he has any literary tact, can fail to admit this. All that remains is to examine the different sections of the Second Isaiah more closely, both from the point of view of ideas and from that of style, using Ewald's suggestions as working hypotheses, and modifying them as may be found necessary, in accordance with deeper study both of Isaiah xl.—lxvi. and of other monuments of the Babylonian or Persian period.

Let us start from Ewald's hypothesis with regard to (*a*) lvi. 9—lvii. 11*a*, the longest of the three passages of earlier date, inserted, according to this critic, in the Prophecy of Restoration, and therefore presumably the most abundant in evidences of its origin. Is the date pre-Exilic, as Ewald holds, or Exilic ? The Palestinian aspect of the description in lvii. 5, 6, the probable reference to persecution in lvii. 1, and the correspondence of the sins imputed to the people with those of Israel before the Exile, have been felt to give

---

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, iv. 251—253.

<sup>2</sup> Cheyne. *The Prophecies of Isaiah*, ii. 228.

a strong plausibility to Ewald's view. Indeed, almost the only recent book in which an Exilic date is defended, is the posthumous introduction to the Old Testament by the lamented Edward Riehm.<sup>1</sup> Far be it from me to disparage one to whom I was myself many years ago indebted ; but the truth must here be spoken, that though eminent in Biblical theology and exegesis, Riehm had not a keen eye for literary criticism, and is not the best of guides in this department. Still, we must not close our ears to reasonable objections from any trained scholar, and Riehm's objections are these : (1.) That it has not yet been satisfactorily shown that the discourse presupposes (exclusively ?) pre-Exilic circumstances, and (2), that there are four points of contact in chapters lvi. and lvii. with passages in chapter liii. and Jer. ii.<sup>2</sup> As to the first of these, we need not deny the abstract possibility that some of the sins denounced may have continued during the Exile ; but we must assert dogmatically that the description corresponds to what we know of pre-Exilic practices. As to the second, the only parallelism which has the least importance is that in lvii. 1 and liii. 8, and this is perfectly consistent with the theory here maintained respecting Isaiah lii. 13—liii. 12. At the end of his paragraph, moreover, Riehm makes this valuable concession, that in describing the idolatry of the exiles (these are Riehm's words, not mine) the prophet must have taken similar descriptions by pre-Exilic prophets as his model. I now venture to refer to myself. In 1870 my opinion was that a historical retrospect like that in the disputed passage might possibly have been composed by an Exilic prophet who was familiar with the denunciations of his predecessors, and, by hearsay at any rate, with the scenery of Palestine. The evil "watchmen" and "shepherds" spoken of in lvi. 10-11, might, I thought, be the prophets and elders who continued to be the guides

<sup>1</sup> *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (1890), ii. 141.

<sup>2</sup> Compare lvi. 11 with liii. 6 ; lvii. 1 with liii. 8 ; lvii. 5 with Jer. ii. 20 ; and lvii. 10 with Jer. ii. 25.

of the Jewish community during the Exile. Nor could I satisfy myself as to the existence of a suture or join in lvii. 11. This was, I suppose, a natural position to take up in 1870. But in the course of ten years it became clear to me that the harshness of the style, contrasting as it does with the smoothness of the passages between which the piece is inserted, is not to be accounted for on my earlier theory. At the very outset of the section (v. 9) we find archaisms (אַתְּ יְשִׁירֵ, חִירֵ) which, though not unparalleled in the later literature, are contrary to the habit of the Second Isaiah; nor is there any at all striking point of contact with that prophet's work, except it be the reduplication of מִנְגָּד in lvii. 6, which surely belongs to the rhetoric of all times and nations. If Isa. lvi. 9—lvii. 11a (13a), came before us in a pre-Exilic work, would any one dream of referring it to the Exile? So strongly was Luzzatto (a conservative Jewish critic) impressed by its antique character, that he declared this passage, and this alone, in Isa. xl.-lxvi., to be not Isaiah's, but the work of one of his later contemporaries, and supposed lvii. 1, 2, to be a dirge written in commemoration of Isaiah's martyrdom.<sup>1</sup> A Jewish tradition, as we all know, placed this event in the reign of the persecutor Manasseh—the reign in which Ewald and others, for good reasons, place the whole or the greater part of the sixth and seventh chapters of Micah.<sup>2</sup> The only question is whether the Second Isaiah, or an editor, connected lvi. 9—lvii. 11a (13a) with the rest of the chapter. Stade is of opinion that the vigour and originality of the Second Isaiah forbid us to suppose that he adopted passages from other prophets. This is plausible. One would have expected such a great writer to alter the phraseology more, and so make the passage his own (cf. below on lii. 13—liii. 12).

<sup>1</sup> Bredenkamp's impression is somewhat similar. He agrees that the passage is not by the author of the main part of Isa. xl.-lxvi., but thinks that it is really the work of Isaiah, who, in lvii. 1, 2, expresses a presentiment of his own fate.

<sup>2</sup> Mic. vii. 7-20, however, are more probably Exilic.

An editor who wished to find a home for this (probably) pre-Exilic passage, may have worked it up with a fragment of the Second Isaiah's work. At any rate, lvi. 9, etc., must be regarded as parenthetical; chap. lx. is the natural sequel of chaps. liv. and lv. (cf. lx. 1, etc., with liv. 1, lv. 12).

(b) The next of the three alleged early passages to be examined is llii. 13—liii. 12. The argument for Ewald's theory (*i.e.*, that the passage is borrowed from an older prophet) is clearly not so strong here as in the former case. It is quite true that llii. 13, etc. (like lvi. 9, etc.), has somewhat the appearance of a parenthesis. It is not very closely connected either with the preceding or with the following section. In its style, too, it contrasts very strongly with the work in which it is imbedded, and reminds us by its harshness of lvi. 9—lvii. 11. On the other hand, it is by no means without points of contact with the admitted Deutero-Isaianic prophecies, and, putting aside the remarkably definite individualisation of the picture, both the description and the ideas seem to be not wholly incompatible with the authorship of the Second Isaiah. The question is, whether we can sufficiently account for the peculiarities of the piece by regarding it as a fly-sheet written some time after the preceding and (probably) the next following discourses, at a time when the idea of vicarious suffering, in all its consequences, had taken such a hold of the prophet's mind as even to impede his utterance. As in 1880, my own impression still is that this is not the case. If the Second Isaiah ever used older material, he did so here. But I cannot, unfortunately, endorse the opinion of Ewald, that he took over the older passage almost without any important alteration; and in this I am glad to have the support of Dillmann. It seems quite impossible even to approach the form of the older passages. We can but conjecture that it referred to a prophet-martyr—whether Jeremiah or another—and that the striking feature of his symbolic leprosy was derived from an early Book of Job, which was probably entirely narrative, and

preceded that now extant in the Canon. Isa. lvii. 1, 2; Mic. vii. 2a, may refer inclusively to this martyrdom.<sup>1</sup>

(c) The last of Ewald's supposed Manasseh passages, xl. 1, 2, is regarded by all critics but Ewald as the Second Isaiah's work.

We now pass on to (d and e) chaps. lviii. and lix., which Ewald makes into a single prophecy with five strophes, but which is rather a pair of prophecies, separated by only a brief interval. Let us first inquire whether Ewald is right in denying that more than one or two verses (lviii. 12, lix. 21) contain the Second Isaiah's work, or whether we may not have recourse again to the theory of fly-sheets, and account for the peculiarities of these companion addresses by a change in the circumstances and mood of the author. The second alternative must, I fear, be rejected. If no limit is to be placed to the application of the theory of fly-sheets, I know not how much may not be annexed to the domain of a single great prophet. Baron Bunsen had no scruple in asserting that not only Isaiah xl.-lxvi., but the disputed passages in the first part of our book, and the two appended discourses in Jeremiah (l. and li.), together with Lamentations, many of the Psalms, and the Book of Job, were all by the Second Isaiah, or, to give him his right name, Baruch, the secretary of Jeremiah. I do not myself think that the Second Isaiah can be safely credited with the authorship of any minor works, or fly-sheets, which are not closely related, not only in style, but in subject, to his chief work. Applying this principle, I am unable to admit that Isaiah lviii. and lix. can have been put forth for the edification of the people by the Second Isaiah. Both chapters place us in the midst of a community free from idolatry and punctual in legal observances (notice a characteristic phrase of the Levitical legislation in lviii. 3-5). This will surely not fit the Second Isaiah. In the former,

---

<sup>1</sup> Jer. xvii. 19-27, is an interpolation, though modelled on the style of Jeremiah. See my *Jeremiah*, vol. I. (1883), p. 418; Kuenen, *Onderzoek*, 2nd ed., II. (1889), p. 176.

though the Jewish people suffer much from oppression, its need is not yet so great as to affect the course of daily business; in the latter, its condition is so hopeless, and ruin seems so imminent, that a horrible dread has seized upon all men. As Bredenkamp truly observes, a corruption so deep as that described in lix. 3-8, and a condition so desperate as that in lix. 9-11, do not characterise the period of the Exile. Consider (2) this fresh point—that, though the stress laid upon fasting in chap. lviii., both by the mass of the Jews and by the prophet, and upon Sabbath-keeping, may not be inconsistent with an Exilic date (see Zech. vii. 3; Ezek. xx. 11-21; xxii. 8, 26), yet it is without a parallel in the acknowledged II. Isaiah. It is, at any rate, entirely in the spirit of post-Exilic writers (see Zech. vii. 5, viii. 19; Joel ii. 12, 13; Neh. xiii. 15-22).<sup>1</sup> Notice (3) that there is no reference to Babylonia, and that lix. 20 implies that the Jews are at this time in "Zion," and especially (4) that there is no human helper, no Cyrus, on the horizon.

The difficulty of ascribing chap. lix. to II. Isaiah is greatly increased by the defects of its style. I doubt if we can even ascribe so badly composed a work to the same author as chap. lviii. The glaring picture of depravity in vv. 1—8 is unrelieved by any touch of human feeling. How unlovely, too, is the mixture of figures in v. 5b! The middle verses (vv. 9—15a) are still more awkwardly expressed, and cohere neither with the preceding nor with the following section. The Divine intervention is anticipated in lix. 15b-17, with the utmost confidence (note the prophetic perfects). But what does this confidence rest upon? The restoration of God's favour should be conditional on hearty repentance. But all that lix. 9—13 says is, that the people (including the prophet) is in deep misery, and fully conscious of its evil deserts. There is no vow of amendment of life; no appeal to God's covenant-love. We have to take for

<sup>1</sup> Klostermann and Bredenkamp, however, in accordance with their theory (see above), ascribe chap. lviii. to Isaiah.

granted that preaching like that in chap. lviii. has produced an effect, and that the prophet knows intuitively that the voice of true penitence has been "heard on high" (lviii. 4). How can we ascribe such a composition to that great master of speech, the Second Isaiah?

But is there nothing to be said on the other side? Certainly there are some exegetical data which may seem to be opposed to a post-Exilic date. In lviii. 12, the rebuilding of ancient ruins, and in lviii. 14, the triumphant occupation of the heights of Canaan, are promised as the rewards of obedience. In both cases, however, the difficulty is more in appearance than in reality. The recurrent calamities of the post-Exile period did not extinguish the Jewish craving for independence (see Hag. ii. 22), and Sanballat even accused Nehemiah of intending to set himself up as king (Neh. vi. 6). This accounts for lviii. 14. And as to lviii. 12, which undoubtedly resembles lxi. 4, it may be truly said that the language was almost as applicable after the return of the Jews as before. It was a slow process, the repairing of ruined cities, as Nehemiah's picturesque description of his own work at Jerusalem shows. I may add that the writer of lviii. 12 is not, in my opinion, the writer of the rest of the chapter. Two great awkwardnesses of expression, *וְבָנֵי מִמְּקָדְשָׁת* and *בְּתִיבוֹת* *קָשָׁת*, suggest the theory that ver. 12 was inserted by the editor of Isa. xl.-lxvi. (or, at least, of Isa. xl.-lxii.), to adapt chap. lviii. to its new position in the midst of Deutero-Isaianic works. Still less need we stumble at an exegetical fact, pointed out by Mr. G. A. Smith, that "judgment" and "righteousness," are used in chap. lix. in the same sense as in the acknowledged work of II. Isaiah. Of course, the influence of the Second Isaiah was felt by the writer of these chapters. How could it be otherwise? So, also, was that of the true Isaiah (cf. perhaps lix. 3, 7 with i. 15, 21; lix. 19 with xxx 27), and that of Ezekiel (cf. lviii. with Ezek. xviii. 7, 16, and lix. 16 with Ezek. xxii. 30). And so, too, was that of the introduction to the Book of Proverbs (lix. 7a being

taken from Prov. i. 16), which is very possibly a work of the Persian period.

The determination of the period of chaps. lviii. and lix. has an important bearing on that of other passages. If these two documents are post-Exilic it becomes all the more probable that (*f*) lvi. 1-8, is so, too. Let us, then, study this brief but pointed prophecy. How strongly it contrasts in style with the flowing oratory of chap. lv.! The author has absorbed the ideas of the Second Isaiah, and adopts some of his phrases (see vv. 1, 5). But his circumstances are different. The situation is briefly this: The religion of Yahveh has begun to attract foreigners; proselytes have attached themselves to the regenerate people of Israel. But alas! a cloud of anxiety overspreads their minds. A new spirit of exclusivism has sprung up at Jerusalem. Those who speak in the name of Yahveh threaten to separate the proselytes from the people, contrary to the spirit of Deut. xxiii. 7. There are also Israelites who have been forced to become eunuchs at the Court of the "great king," but who are earnest adherents of the great spiritual religion of Jeremiah and the Second Isaiah. These take their exclusion from the congregation to be a matter of course, and yet they cannot help mingling their tears with those of the proselytes. For they know the great prophecy in Isa. xliv. 1-5, and cannot understand how the bountiful promise of God should be confined to a select aristocracy. Now, how can the accession of proselytes be understood while the Jews are still in exile? Especially as ver. 7, in its most natural sense, implies the existence of the Temple. These few verses do, in fact, pre-suppose a very different situation from that of Isa. xliv. 1-5.

Proselytes have begun to offer themselves, as the author of that passage and the writer of xiv. 1, 2 declared that they would do. But in Jerusalem the reforming movement of Ezra and Nehemiah has generated a new spirit of exclusivism. Against this the prophet contends. He fortifies his position by a special revelation in these words: "An

oracle of Adonai Yahveh, the gatherer of the outcasts of Israel. Yet more will I gather unto him, besides his gathered ones." Why does he employ such an unusual introductory formula? The addition of Gentile members to the true Israel was by no means a new announcement (see xliv. 5; lv. 5). Evidently, the older prophet's teaching had fallen into neglect. In one respect, however, this new prophet agrees with Nehemiah. He thinks much of the duty of Sabbath-keeping, and in this he agrees with the author of a neighbouring but independent prophecy (see lviii. 13, 14). We must refer both prophecies to the same period. It was a troublous time, as lvi. 1, not less than lviii. 2, implies. Deliverance from the oppressor is in both eagerly hoped for, and the ideal sketched in lvi. 7 (end) finely completes that of lviii. 14.

T. K. CHEYNE.

---